

and red remittance lights. Thus, it would be impossible to distinguish the fluorescence image from the background image.

Conclusion

The Claim Rejections are not correct by the following reasons:

1. My invention has substantial differences from the invention of MacAulay et al. '660.
2. It is obvious that it was not easy for experts in the field (for example, endoscopic technicians of OLYMPUS), who already had the knowledge taught by MacAulay et al. and Longacre et al. to develop a fluorescence electronic endoscopic system with the same functions as mine.
3. The filing date of Alfano et al. '556 (Jan. 28, 2000) is later to the filing date of my invention to the Japanese Patent Office (March 17, 1999).

Remarks

For the application and response to the first office Action, I asked Mr. Martin L Stoneman of Stoneman Law Offices to represent me. According to his opinion, claims 1-5, which are originally written by me, have been cancelled. The new claims have been added for the reason to be in compliance with U.S. law and practice. However, it seems to me that, by the new claims 6-25, it is not clear what are the points of my invention, which are different from MacAulay et al. 's. Therefore, I would like to at least put claims 1-5 back. Can I amend the claims after the advisory action or need I pay the transition fee? Would you please inform me, for example, what I should do, how much money I need to pay for any fees, to fax number 81-29-851-3721.

Respectfully submitted

Ekapot Bhunachet

Date: September 25, 2004

Ekapot Bhunachet

2-32-22 Kasaga, Tsukuma

Ibaraki, 305-0821

JAPAN